

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	San Francisquito Joint Powers Authority	Amount Requested	\$3,500,000
Proposal Title	San Francisquito Creek Flood Protection and Ecosystem Restoration Capital Improvement Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$24,500,000

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project increases the stream capacity of San Francisquito Creek by widening the stream bank, installing a floodwall, replacing two bridges, and creating the West Bayshore Inlet to accommodate a wider Highway 101 bridge. The project also removes channel constriction and stabilizes the banks by replanting and establishing riparian vegetation.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	6/15	Technical Justification	4/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	1/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	18/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5	Program Preferences	5/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			38

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

Criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. From the information provided, the scope of work, the status of that work, and how the proposed project fits into the larger "Comprehensive Project", is unclear. The proposed project "represents the third of five phases that will provide comprehensive flood protection, ecosystem restoration, and recreational benefits throughout the system." However, from the description provided, only Phase 1 and Phase 2 are identified, leaving the reviewer to assume the Phase 3 header has been omitted from the Work Plan description, and to guess at where the proposed project (Phase 3) begins and ends. It appears that the project proposed is that described as "item 3) Highway 101 to El Camino Real (2% baseline project) in Reach 2" (pg. 3-1), but consistent description of the project in the application is lacking. The 2% baseline project consists of 5 elements (West Bayshore Inlet, Channel Widening at 4 location, Newell bridge replacement and Pope-Chaucer Bridge replacement, and EIR for all elements). However, the applicant indicates that "SFCJPA wishes to use State funding for the West Bayshore

Inlet...which is at 90% design level completion.” Throughout the application (work plan, budget and schedule), it appears that the proposed project relates to the entire Phase 3 Project, not just the West Bayshore Inlet. It could be the applicant wished to apply cost share to the other components of Phase 3, but this is never made clear.

The applicant indicates that the Phase 3 Project meets 5 of 6 Bay Area IRWMP goals, but does not elaborate. Subtask 10.2 (Project Construction) indicates that the proposed project will construct all 5 elements; however, no details, aside from element name, are included to describe the work. Additionally, CEQA status is unclear. Applicant states (pg. 3-14) “It is anticipated that the Draft EIR...will be released in August 2011...and the Final EIR will be adopted in February 2012,” inconsistent with the date given in the Schedule, Att. 5, which indicates 2014 as the Final EIR date. Other issues include: applicant provides a list of existing data and studies, as required by the PSP, but does not clearly indicate how each is relevant to the proposed project; the map provided (pg. 3-8) is inadequate to indicate the location of any of the five elements described; and the applicant states that one project element is at 90% (pg. 3-2, West Bayshore Inlet), with plans provided, but design status for the remaining 4 is unclear. The applicant states that the Reach 2 project will provide secondary habitat and water quality benefits, but whether flood control benefits independent of the other phases would be expected is not clear from the provided information.

BUDGET

A score of 2 is awarded as the budget for the proposed project does not include detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 of the PSP, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for all of the budget categories described in Exhibit B of the PSP. Further, the tasks shown in the budget are not entirely consistent with the tasks shown in the work plan and schedule. For example, the budget includes Subtask 5.1 (Conceptual Design), which is not included or described in the work plan, and the schedule includes Subtask 6.1 and 6.2 (SWPPP preparation), which is not found in the budget. Additionally, the budget attachment does not contain an explanation of how the project costs are estimated for any of the proposed tasks. Hourly rates are provided only for Project Administration tasks, while other labor-related tasks, such as Planning, Design, Engineering, are provided as lump sum costs with no other supporting information. The summary budget and the associated grand totals are mathematically incorrect and do not match the totals shown in Table 6 or the detailed budget table.

SCHEDULE

Criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The applicant provides a graphic which broadly outlines the proposed schedule, but shows little detail. Starting and ending dates for proposed Tasks show only approximate dates. The schedule only provides information at the Task level; individual Subtasks are omitted. The schedule is not consistent with the work plan and budget and is clearly not reasonable. The schedule indicates that construction will start in June 2014 and end in October 2015, but the work plan indicates a later start date: “The Reach 2 Project will commence after the completion of the Reach 1 and Caltrans projects, anticipate in 2015.” The work plan indicates that the Caltrans Project will occur in the 2014 and 2015 construction seasons, which would not allow for the start of the Phase 3 Project in June 2014. Due to conflicting dates throughout the application, the schedule for construction of the Phase 3 Project is inconsistent and unclear. The release dates of the Draft and Final EIR in the work plan text do not match the dates provided in the schedule; the text indicates that Draft EIR will be released in August 2011 and adopted in February 2012, while the schedule indicates dates of November 2013 and April 2014, respectively. Task 4, Land Acquisition, is a construction predecessor. The schedule indicates that there will be overlap in land acquisition and construction, but the applicant provides no explanation why land acquisition is not targeted for completion before construction commences.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. Based on the description of the project scope given in work plan, that the project will complete Phase 3 of the overall 5-phase San Francisquito Creek project, it is not clear whether the identified monitoring targets are appropriate for the benefits claimed; they appear to apply to the complete 5-phase project. Thus, whether the measurement tools and methods effectively monitor project performance and target progress, or if it is feasible to meet the targets within the life of the project, is unclear. Some of the targets are either non-quantitative (reduce flood risks) or given in terms of an undefined baseline (improve opportunities for recreation), so knowing whether the targets are met with project implementation is not possible. Additionally, applicant does not include a discussion of how monitoring data will be used to measure the performance in meeting the overall goals and objectives of the IRWM Plan.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

A score of 2 is awarded as the technical justification of the proposal cannot be determined due to a lack of documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project and/or physical benefits are not well described. The applicant includes a table that summarizes quantifiable physical benefits of the project; however, the described benefits appear to pertain to completion of the 5-phase San Francisquito Creek Project, not to the limited project proposed for the funding—either Phase 3 (which is contained in Reach 2) or only the West Bayshore Inlet portion of Phase 3. The applicant indicates that the Reach 2 project will build upon the Reach 1 project phases, and that the additional work needed to accommodate Reach 2 project construction includes completion of Reach 1 (construction start in 2013) and the construction of the Highway 101 Bridge (construction start in 2014). None of the supporting technical information, which is considerable, appears to pertain specifically to the benefits from the proposed project. Further, it is unclear when the West Bayshore Inlet portion of the Phase 3 Project would occur, and the degree of certainty of when and if the other phases and components of the project necessary to realize the project benefits will be built. While much technical documentation is provided, some of it seems irrelevant to the project or the applicant does not sufficiently describe how this documentation supports the technical justification for the proposed project. For instance, one benefit, reduced sedimentation, seems to include sedimentation that occurs in Searsville Lake, which is upstream of the 5-phase San Francisquito project.

BENEFITS AND COSTS EVALUATION

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium to high level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking.

Total project cost is shown as \$49.8 million in PV. Construction costs are consistent with Attachment 4. Annual maintenance costs of \$8,000 per year are shown. Expected life is 50 years from completion of construction. No operations or intermediate replacement costs are shown.

FDR benefits are calculated using the HEC-FDA model. FLO 2-D modeling was used for hydrologic analysis supporting the flood inundation areas and depths. The main categories of damage avoided are residential and commercial structures, contents and vehicles, erosion and sedimentation, and displaced residents. Detailed information is presented on depth-damage relationships for the different categories of damage, for eight geographic subareas (called economic impact areas). GIS was used to link parcels to the flood inundation area.

Attachment 8 did not clearly identify what flood events were used to estimate the EAD. Tables in an appendix to Attachment 7 show results from the HEC FDA model for without-project damages by category and exceedance probability. Reviewer could find no similar analysis for with-project damages. The description of EAD calculations

suggests that the FLO2D modeling estimated “water in the floodplain strictly as a result of levee overtopping”, whereas “the primary constraint causing overbank flooding is numerous bridge underpasses that restrict water flow”. Therefore, it is unclear if the improvements provided by this particular proposed project have actually been modeled.

EAD avoided was calculated by HEC-FDA and reported in Table 8-14 as \$4.1 million, with a PV of \$64.6 million. The text describes other potentially significant FDR benefits that were not quantified. Other non-monetized benefits are described, including health and safety, improvements in sidewalks and bicycle lanes, and potential habitat improvements.

An additional monetized benefit was estimated for recreational enhancement, but the value was only \$0.134 million in PV.

Whereas the level of benefits could be high, concerns about the flood modeling make the underlying technical analysis an issue, so the benefits are uncertain.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Five program preferences are met: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Attainment of CALFED objectives, Integrate Water Management with Land Use Planning, Climate Change Response Actions, and Expand Environmental Stewardship.

The application, in its discussion of program preferences, addresses the “project” to be the Comprehensive Project (San Francisquito Creek Flood Protection Project), which includes five phases that encompass two reaches of San Francisquito Creek. The proposed project is limited to the Phase 3 Project, which is in Reach 2 of the Comprehensive Project. As a whole, the Comprehensive Project would meet many of the program preferences; however, the assurance of the Phase 3 project meeting all program preferences as a “stand-alone” is not adequately supported. There is no documentation that the Reach 1 or Caltrans Projects are fully funded or on schedule for completion, so certainty of providing the claimed benefits seems uncertain.